

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 10, 13 and 14 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

Rejection Under 35 USC 112

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner points out that the “edge” in line 2 of claim 1 has insufficient basis. By way of the present Amendment, this has now been changed “edges”. The Examiner also objects to the phrase “adapted to support”. This has now been changed. Accordingly, this rejection is overcome. In regard to claims 5 and 6, “computer” has been removed from the phrase in the second line so that the remaining language does have antecedent basis in claim 1.

Rejection Under 35 USC 102

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 10 and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Nicolai et al. (US Patent 6,123, 400). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that the reference shows a chassis usable with a computer with a chassis frame 10 with load bearing rails 30 located on edges and a plurality of protrusions on the sides of the rails to support a chassis cover 63 and to laterally secure a removable structure 40.

Applicant submits that the claims are not anticipated by this reference. First, it is noted that this device is used for a switching cabinet not a computer chassis frames. Further, Applicant submit that amended claim 1 includes limitations not seen in the reference. Claim 1 points out that the protrusions are formed on the tops of the load bearing rails. This arrangement is not seen in any fashion in the Nicolai et al. Further, it is noted that the chassis frame laterally secures the removable structure in at least two directions by coupling the protrusions with portions of the structure. While Figure 3, shows the connecting pieces 30 being screwed to the rails extending therebetween, it is not seen that this is laterally secured in at least two directions. Further, it is

not seen that these are coupled to the protrusions but instead are attached thereto. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 defines over this reference.

Claims 2, 4-6, 9 and 10 depend from claim 1 and as such are also considered to be allowable. In addition, each of these claims recite other features that make them additionally allowable. In particular, claim 9 describes the structure as housing at least one computer component, which is not seen in the reference. Claim 10 describes the structure as having protrusions corresponding to the protrusions of the chassis frame which are not seen in the reference. Accordingly, these claims are similarly allowable.

Claim 13 likewise defines over Nicolai et al. in describing a computer chassis rather than a switching cabinet. Claim 13 also now describes the means for supporting the chassis cover as being located on top surfaces of the chassis frame. In addition, the removable structure is also described as housing at least one computer component. The removable structure is also secured in at least two directions. For these reasons, Applicant submit that the claims define over the Nicolai et al. reference.

Rejection Under 35 USC 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 10, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Chang (US Patent 5,164,886) in view of Jeong (US Patent 6,404,624). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that Chang shows a chassis frame 2, rails 5 and 24, and a plurality of protrusions for securing removable structures 6. The Examiner admits that Change does not disclose the protrusions as supporting a chassis cover.

The Examiner cites Jeong to show a computer chassis apparatus with a load bearing surface in the form of the upper surface of element 40 including protrusions for supporting a chassis cover. The Examiner feels that it would have been obvious to replace Chang's protrusions with Jeong's protrusions.

Applicant disagrees that the claims would be obvious over this combination of references. First, it is pointed out that the Chang reference utilizes hooks and notches for connecting the various elements. Applicant submit that these are different from the protrusions

found in the present invention. In particular, it is noted that the protrusions in the present invention extend upwardly from the load bearing surface and are designed to support a chassis cover. In Chang, the hooks extend through the notches to position the structure laterally, but does not support the structure.

Claim 1 describes the frame as having a set of load bearing rails along the edges of the frame. Applicant submits that elements 5 and 24 are not along the edges of the frame, but rather extend from the middle of the sides. Further, the protrusions described in the claim are not met by the hook and notch arrangement. Further, the reference does not include protrusions which support the chassis cover. Further, the protrusions do not secure the structure to the chassis frame in at least two directions.

It is also noted that the Jeong reference may provide a load bearing surface, however it is also not along the edges of the frame. Accordingly, Applicant submits that even the combination of these two references does not show the invention defined by claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2, 4-6, 9 and 10 depend from claim 1 and as such are also considered to be allowable. In addition, each of these claims recite other features that make them additionally allowable.

Claim 13 likewise is not obvious over this combination of references. In particular, the means for supporting is now stated to be located on top surfaces of the computer chassis frame. Further, the structure is secured to the frame in at least two directions. Applicant submit that claim 13 is likewise allowable.

Claim 14 is also not obvious over this combination of references. Claim 14 describes the frame as having at least two upward facing surfaces. The upward facing surfaces also have formed thereon a plurality of oblong rounded domes. The shape of the dome is not seen in any of the references. Further, the movable drive ring is described as having interface structures which correspond to each rounded dome and are secured over each rounded dome to secure the structure in at least two directions. This arrangement of the domes and interface structures is not seen in any of the references. Accordingly, this claim is additionally allowable.

Conclusion


In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert F. Gnuse Reg. No. 27,295 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 17, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Joe McKinney Muncy
Registration No.: 32,334
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

ROBERT F. GNUSE
Registration # 27295